REMARKS

Enclosed, please find a Information Disclosure Statement and a PTOL 1449 listing a number of papers which have been published. Also enclosed is one or more CD-ROMs which include copies of the papers and copies of office actions rejecting claims of patent applications in the same family of patent applications. Recent Federal Circuit law made it inequitable conduct to fail to disclose office action rejections of similar claims in other cases. Since there are other continuation-in-part patent applications which all stem back to the original parent application which became U.S. patent 6,681,383, the possibility that these other office actions might be deemed relevant dictates disclosure of these other office actions to allow the Examiner to decide if the rejections and art cited in support of them are relevant to the claims at hand.

All the currently pending claims have been cancelled and a new set of claims have been filed which refocus this case back on the subject matter which the applicants wish to cover. The cancellation of all currently pending claims renders all the rejections current office action moot. The new prior art cited with this office action is different and more comprehensive than the prior art of record.

Generally, speaking, new independent claim 25 is believed to be novel because the prior art does not disclose any tool which allows the user to enter primitives which define a functionally complete target computer program which needs no additional code components added to it to be complete and which has with a full user interface. New claim 25 also calls for instructions stored on the CD-ROM which control the computer to validate the formal language specification to ensure it is complete, correct and unambiguous. The prior art papers cited herein do not teach validation. The prior art papers also do not teach a presentation model which can specify the user interface by means of four main primitives: service presentation pattern; instance presentation pattern, class population presentation

PATENT

pattern and master-detail presentation pattern. The claim term "presentation model" should

be interpreted to mean data structures formed from the user input which defines one or

more of these patterns for the user interface of the target program.

The prior art papers do not disclose all the properties of the elements of the

conceptual model such as aliases for classes and attributes and services and a whole list

of many other new features. In the dynamic model, it is new to allow actions to apply to

events as well as local transactions and it is new to have a "for all" trigger destination.

There are many other new things about the dynamic model also such as push-pop, state-

independent and discrete domain valuation as opposed to attribute characterization which

is taught in the prior art papers. In the presentation model, service presentation pattern and

introduction pattern are new as are defined selection patterns, display set patterns, filter

patterns, filter variables, population selection patterns and dependency patterns, status

recovery patterns, supplementary information patterns, argument grouping presentation

patterns, instance presentation patterns, class population presentation patterns, master-

detail presentation patterns and action selection patterns.

The validation process is also new in that completeness checks verify that the there

is no missing information in the requirements specification and correctness checks verify

that the information introduced in the conceptual model is syntactically and semantically

consistent and not ambiguous. Partial or full validation can be carried out.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 7, 2005

Ronald Craig Fish

Reg. No. 28,843 Tel 408 866 4777

FAX 408 866 4785

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States

27

Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents , P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450. on $\frac{\log \tau \log s}{(\text{Date of Deposit})}$

Roudd c. Fish

Signature of Depositer